

Serial No. 10/063,185
Filed: March 28, 2002
Page 11 of 11

Examiner: Emmanuel S. Luk
Group Art Unit: 1722

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-64 are pending in the application, and have been allowed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowability.

Claims 11-13, 23, 24, 32, 33, 41, 42, 51, 52, and 61-64 stand objected to as allegedly being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 10-13, 23, 24, 32, 33, 41, 42, 51, 52, and 61-64 have been cancelled without prejudice in this paper.

The objection to claims 11-13, 23, 24, 32, 33, 41, 42, 51, 52, and 61-64 is traversed. The Examiner asserts that claims 11-13, 23, 24, 32, 33, 41, 42, 51, 52, and 61-64 fail to further limit the parent claims because they are intended use of the apparatus in terms of the line speed of the material. To the contrary, these claims do further limit the scope of the prior claim. In the parent claim, the gap is defined in terms of a ratio wherein the denominator of the ratio is the line speed. The objected claims further limit the line speed and the ratio, and are thus in proper dependent form. Nevertheless, solely in order to advance prosecution after the protracted examination of this application, claims 10-13, 23, 24, 32, 33, 41, 42, 51, 52, and 61-64 have been cancelled without prejudice.

If there are any questions, please contact the undersigned attorney.


Respectfully submitted,

WAYNE J. MYER & BLAINE M. KELLY

Dated:

Nov. 28, 2005

By:


Mark A. Davis, Reg. No. 37,118
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
MCGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0198487.DOC